

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 12 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication that claim 31 is objected to but includes allowable subject matter. The subject matter of claim 31 has been incorporated into independent claim 16 (note that the term "missing" has been changed to "other"). Thus claim 16 and the claims depending therefrom are patentable.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a filter coupled to a pipeline resource that causes one address space in pipeline resource to be flushed while other address spaces are maintained. Amended claim 1 is patentable over the cited art. U.S. Patent No. 5,230,045 (Sindhu), over which claim 1 stands rejected as anticipated, nowhere teaches or suggests a filter coupled to a pipeline resource. As to Sindhu, the Office Action indicates that map cache 58 is the recited pipeline resource. However, Sindhu nowhere teaches a filter coupled to this map cache to cause one address space to be flushed while others are maintained. That is, while Sindhu teaches that several operations are available to flush entries from map cache 58, there is no teaching or suggestion to enable these operations with a filter. Instead, these commands are sent directly to map cache 58.

For at least similar reasons, the claims depending from claim 1 are also patentable, including new dependent claims 34-37. In this regard, nothing in Sindhu anywhere teaches that this non-existent filter includes multiple entries each including a pair of valid indicators, an address space identifier, and a thread identifier, as set forth in claim 34. Nor does Sindhu anywhere teach the recited control register including an entry for each entry of the filter as recited in dependent claim 36.

Regarding claim 20, the cited art nowhere teaches or suggests storing a value and an address space identifier in both an entry of a pipeline resource and an entry of a filter coupled to the pipeline resource. The cited art further fails to teach or suggest receiving an address space identifier and an address from a senior store or snoop and determining whether such values match an entry in this filter. As described above, Sindhu, over which claim 20 stands rejected as being anticipated, fails to teach this filter. The further cited art also fails to teach or suggest this recited filter and the operations set forth in claim 20. Accordingly, claim 20 and the claims depending therefrom are patentable over the cited art.

Regarding amended claim 8, the cited art nowhere teaches or suggests invalidating all non-global entries of a pipeline resource and maintaining all global entries thereof. In this

regard, both Sindhu and Zuraski, contended by the Office Action to include the subject matter of previously pending claims 11-13 (see Office Action, page 7), fail to anywhere discuss maintaining of such global entries while non-global entries are invalidated. Accordingly, claim 8 and the claims depending therefrom are patentable over the cited art.

New dependent claims 34 to 42 are patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

In view of these remarks, the application is now in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/12/07



Mark J. Reznick
Registration No. 42,117
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 S. Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, Texas 77057-2631
(512) 418-9944 [Phone]
(713) 468-8883 [Fax]
Customer No.: 21906